IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY

APPELLATE SIDE

WRIT PETITION NO. 1897 OF 2006

URMILA SHIVPRAKASH RAI ... PETITIONER.

VS.

STATE BANK OF INDIA. ... RESPONDENT.

ALONGWITH

WRIT PETITION NO. 1917 OF 2006

CHANDRAKANT UMAJI MATAL ... PETITIONER.

VS.

STATE BANK OF INDIA. ... RESPONDENT.

ALONGWITH

WRIT PETITION NO. 1922 OF 2006

SACHIN T. MAHADIK ... PETITIONER.

VS.

STATE BANK OF INDIA. ... RESPONDENT.

ALONGWITH

WRIT PETITION NO. 1990 OF 2006

MAHESH RAJARAM NIKAM ... PETITIONER.

VS.

STATE BANK OF INDIA. ... RESPONDENT.

ALONGWITH

WRIT PETITION NO. 1992 OF 2006

MANGALA RAOSAHEB DESHMUKH ... PETITIONER.

VS.

STATE BANK OF INDIA. ... RESPONDENT.

ALONGWITH

WRIT PETITION NO. 1993 OF 2006

MITALI MANGESH SHINDE ... PETITIONER.

VS.

STATE BANK OF INDIA. ... RESPONDENT.

MS.SEEMA CHOPADE I/B. ABHAY KULKARNI FOR THE PETITIONERS.

MR. A.G.DAMLE FOR THE RESPONDENTS.

CORAM : J.N.PATEL & A. A. SAYED, JJ.

DATE : July 2, 2007.

P.C.

1. Heard the learned Counsel for the parties.

2. All these petitions have been filed by the persons who are claiming appointment on the establishment of State Bank of India on compassionate ground.

3. We are informed at the Bar that in all 41 petitions were filed and were listed before different Benches of this Court and except these six matters, all other matters have been disposed of by this Court with a direction to the State Bank of India to re-examine/ re-consider the cases of the petitioners and take a decision in the matter of their entitlement to be appointed on compassionate ground, as per the rules framed by the State Bank of India in this regard and in the light of various decisions of the Apex Court.

4. The very scheme framed by the State Bank of India is based on the decision of the Honourable Supreme Court rendered in case of UMESH KUMAR NAGPAL reported in (1994) 4 SCC 138. Subsequent to that the issue of appointment on compassionate ground has come up before the Supreme Court and the decision in UMESH NAGPAL's case is taken as a guide-lines for the respondent-Bank to examine each individual case, on its own merit.

5. The learned Counsel for the respondent-Bank has placed before us the recent decision of the Supreme Court, rendered in the case of STATE BANK OF INDIA & ANR. VS. SOMVIR SINGH, REPORTED IN 2007(3) ALL MR 338, wherein the Supreme Court has taken into

consideration its decisions rendered in case of UMESH NAGPAL (1994) 4 SCC 138, UNION BANK OF INDIA VS. M.T.LATHEESH, (2006) 7 SCC 350, GENERAL MANAGER (D&PB) VS. KUNTI TIWARY, (2004) 7 SCC 271. We may add to the list of decisions rendered in case of PUNJAB NATIONAL BANK, reported in (2004) 7 SCC 265 and other cases such as reported in (2005) 7 SCC 206, (2005) 2 SCC 342, (2006) 5 SCC 766, (2006) 9 SCC 195.

6. We, therefore, dispose of these petitions with a direction to the Respondent - Bank to take a decision in the matter of all the Petitioners in the light of the aforesaid decisions and we expect that the Competent Authority of the respondent-bank shall pass speaking Orders while deciding case of each individual petitioner in respect of their claim for being appointed on compassionate ground. We would highly appreciate if the Competent Authority of the Bank would decide the claims within a period of three months from today. We make it clear that no extension of time would be granted.

7. With these observations & directions, these petitions stand disposed of.

.....

[A. A.Sayed, J] **[J.N.Patel, J.]**